



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,200	12/30/2005	Horst Muller	68002-004US1	6258

69713 7590 11/04/2008  
OCCHIUTI ROHLICEK & TSAO, LLP  
10 FAWCETT STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

EXAMINER
----------

BUTTNER, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/04/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@ORTPATENT.COM



Claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear if the percentage is based on the entire multilayer coating or just the layer comprising the microgel.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2,3,7 and 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chang '532.

Chang exemplifies (first table of col 10) polymerizing methacrylic acid, hydroxyethylacrylate and alkylmethacrylates in the presence of the chain transfer agent DMG COBALT3. Vinylphosphonic acid (col 5 line 50) can be used in place of DMG COBALT3. Such a polymerization qualifies as applicant's step a). The resulting macromer is then polymerized with additional monomers (second table of col 10). This qualifies as applicant's additional step recited in claim 3. The resulting material is then

Art Unit: 1796

reacted with Cymel301 (a melamine resin) and other additives which qualifies as applicant's step b).

Claims 1,4,6 and 9-19 are allowable as Chang does not suggest the further radical polymerization c) subsequent to reacting with aminoplast.

Claims 2,3,7 and 8 of this application conflict with claims 1,2,5 and 6 of Application No. 10-567616. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

Claims 2,3,7 and 8 provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1,2,5 and 6 of copending Application No. 10-567616. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states that Chang produces a stable dispersion of graft particles crosslinked with dimethacrylates.

This is not convincing as applicant fails to point to a specific claim limitation that the above teaching is in conflict with. It is noted that applicant too can utilize

Art Unit: 1796

dimethacrylates (page 15 line 30) and that his product is a stable dispersion (page 24 line 3).

Applicant argues Chang's melamine resin does not react with the graft particles, but instead with the binder.

This is unconvincing. Chang clearly states (col 2 line 46-48) the crosslinking agent (ie melamine, polyisocyanate or epoxy) is intended to react with the functional groups on the graft copolymer. The functional graft polymer is the binder as it is the majority polymeric portion of the coating. No other polymer or polymer forming ingredient need be present other than the functional graft polymer and the crosslinker (eg melamine).

Applicant does not dispute the provisional obviousness double patenting rejections.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1796

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Buttner whose telephone number is 571-272-1084. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 10 to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Seidleck, can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Buttner

10/28/08

/David Buttner/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796